



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/634,185	08/09/2000	James S. Hiscock	SYNER-163XX	5742
207	7590	08/15/2005	EXAMINER	
WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109			BARNIE, REXFORD N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/634,185

Applicant(s)

HISCOCK ET AL.

Examiner

REXFORD N. BARNIE

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 12-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 33-41, 43 and 48-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 12-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 33-41, 43 and 48-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Rexford N. Barnie
REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 48 (4-7, 12-15, 20, 23, 24, 33-35, 36-41, 43) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US Pat 2003/0018757) in view of Whitaker et al. (US Pat# 6,130,893) and further in view of Krawez et al. (US Pat# 6,1012,951) or Volansky et al. (US Pat# 5,807,139).

Regarding claim 48, Saito et al. teaches a decentralized computer network comprising a data processing equipment and a plurality of outlets including an inherent faceplate for attachment to a wall in (see fig., paragraph 0055) and can be connected to a plurality of devices not limited to what's shown in (see figs.) based on needs of a user to include same units in different locations. Saito teaches the ability to have bridges in (see paragraph 0061).

Saito fails to teach the components of the outlets or interfaces in detail.

Whitaker teaches a communication network comprising of a plurality of decentralized interfaces wherein the interfaces can be connected to a plurality of data processing means in (see figs. 1, 3) and cols. 3-6) wherein bridges (46) can be employed in each outlet to support communications.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Whitaker thus making it possible to support and provide multi-media services.

The combination teaches an adapter or interface which would be mounted to a wall and would be adapted to receive communication devices.

the combination fails to teach how the housing structure is mounted onto a surface.

Krawez teaches a phone plug for a home phone line system including a home data network which can accommodate a plurality of multimedia devices including a telephone and/or computing device in (see fig. 4A).

Volansky teaches an adapter to which a plurality of multimedia devices can be connected in (see figs., abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of either secondary reference into that of the combination thus making it possible to accommodate and provide multi-services as provided by an adaptor or outlet device.

Regarding claims 33-35 and 37, The combination teaches the ability renders obvious the ability to receive web services, which is conventionally known as long as one subscribes to such services. The combination teaches a web server in (see paragraph 142 of Saito et al.).

Regarding claims 36 and 38, The combination teaches being able to determine information including location, port number, movability information associated with other outlets and so forth (see Saito et al.).

Regarding claims 39-41 and 43, The combinations render the ability to provide multi-media services by using interfaces, data interfaces and so forth.

Regarding claims 4-7, The combination teaches the possibility of having outlets to accommodate a multi-media network environment which can be coupled to surfaces including a wall.

Regarding claim 12, Any network or switches through which services can be provided can be used in light of the combination.

Regarding claims 13-15, The combination teaches outlets with bridges to accommodate communication devices.

Regarding claims 20, 23 and 24, using AC or DC power-to-power network elements is well known and using circuit cards or boards in outlets or adapters to provide interfacing and multi-media services is known.

Claims 16, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US Pat 2003/0018757) in view of Whitaker et al. (US Pat# 6,130,893) and Krawez et al. (US pat# 6,1012,951) or Volansky et al. (US Pat# 5,807,139) and further in view of Gerszberg et al. (US Pat# 6,714,534).

Regarding claims 16-17, It's notoriously well known to encrypt data when authenticating a user for internet services when one logs on and acquires a service.

The combination fails to teach encryption but Gerzberg teaches an adapter which can provide encryption/decryption services in (see col. 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gerzberg into any outlet for the purpose of being able to fraudulent access to network services.

Regarding claim 23, Providing VOIP is well known through an adapter at a customer premise.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US Pat 2003/0018757) in view of Whitaker et al. (US Pat# 6,130,893) and Krawez et al. (US pat# 6,1012,951) or Volansky et al. (US Pat# 5,807,139) and further in view of Vaughn et al. (US Pat# 6,661,893).

Regarding claims 18-19, The combination fails to teach status information which includes a problem.

Vaugh teaches a telephone loop monitoring system in (see col. 4) wherein status information can reported to a user via a display means.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Vaugh into that of the combination thus making it possible to take corrective measures or request help when necessary.

Claims 49-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US Pat 2003/0018757) in view of Whitaker et al. (US Pat# 6,130,893) and further in view of Krawez et al. (US Pat# 6,1012,951) or Volansky et al. (US Pat# 5,807,139) and further in view of Jones(US Pat# 6,404,764).

Regarding claims 49-53, The combination fails to teach the claimed subject matter but Jones et al. teaches a multimedia adapter which can accommodate a digital telephone, receive E-mails (see col.10) and has interfaces including an Ethernet interface, RF interface,1394 interface and provides VOIP services in (see fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to implement the teaching of Jones into that of the combination thus making it possible to provide multimedia services including using digital phones for its ability to receive data.

Claims 54 and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US 2003/0018757) in view of Whitaker et al. (US Pat# 6,130,893).

Regarding claim 54, Saito teaches a communication network which uses a plurality of outlets which can be mounted on a wall to accommodate multi-media devices in (see figs.) and according to in would use some kind of bridge element (paragraph 0061).

For the sake of argument, Saito fails to teach a bridge in the outlet means specifically.

Whitaker teaches a communication network wherein a plurality of adapters can be used to accommodate a plurality of devices wherein the outlets employ bridges in (see figs 3, cols. 3-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Whitaker into that of Saito in order to provide multimedia services.

Regarding claims 56-60, the combination renders the claimed subject matter obvious by teaching a connection to a web server (see Saito et al.) and also, would have been obvious to provide web services if a user subscribes to it.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. in view of Whitaker et al. and further in view of Kikinis (US Pat# 6,167,120).

Regarding claim 55, The combination teaches connection to a network but fails to teach the claimed limitation.

Kikinis teaches a communication system wherein a bridge can be coupled to a network including a PBX in (see fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kikinis into that of the combination thus making it possible to provide multi-media services over any desired Network.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. in view of Whitaker et al. and further in view of Jones et al. (US Pat# 6,661,893).

Regarding claim 61, The combination fails to teach status information which includes a problem.

Vaugh teaches a telephone loop monitoring system in (see col. 4) wherein status information can reported to a user via a display means.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Vaugh into that of the combination thus making it possible to take corrective measures or request help when necessary.

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. in view of Whitaker et al. and further in view of Krawez et al. (US pat# 6,1012,951).

Regarding claim 62, The combination fails to teach the claimed limitation but Krawez teach a communication an adapter with the claimed configuration in (see figs.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of either secondary reference into that of the combination thus making it possible to accommodate and provide multi-service services as provided by an adaptor or outlet device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is 571-272-7492. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

Art Unit: 2643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER
REXFORD BARNIE
08/10/05


REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER